

### **Amendments to the Drawings**

Over the more than six years during which the subject Application has been prosecuted, a cumulative level of confusion has arisen regarding the statuses of several of the figures. **In order to break the repetitive cycle of unsuccessful attempts to meet the Examiner's requirements, it is respectfully requested that:**

- **the present good faith effort to resolve all of the drawing issues be recognized as such;**
- **the status listed here for each figure be specifically confirmed or further clarified in explicit detail; and**
- **whatever additional clarification is necessary be provided to assist applicants in "aiming at the right target", including providing a copy of any version of any figure that should be used as the basis for correction but obviously is not recognized as such by applicants, so that both parties can literally "work from the same sheet of paper".**

#### Figure 1

The version of Figure 1 submitted in November 1998 was approved in the Office communication dated November 1999. However, in the Office communication dated June 2000, another version submitted in March 2000 was also approved. It is believed that the March 2000 version of Figure 1 contains an error in that the reference numeral that should read **44** per the approved November 1998 version was changed to **41** in two places in the March 2000 revision. Therefore, it is requested that the November 1998 version of Figure 1 approved in November 1999 be made the version of record and that the conflicting approval of the March 2000 version be rescinded.

#### Figure 2

The situation with Figure 2 is identical to that with Figure 1 with respect to the dates and the conflicting approvals. However, the reference numeral that should read **44** and was changed in March 2000 to read **41** appears in only one place and a reference numeral **41** and its associated arrow that were correctly added in November 1998 were deleted in March 2000. Therefore, it is requested that the November 1998 version of Figure 2 approved in November 1999 be made the version of record and that the conflicting approval of the March 2000 version be rescinded.

Figure 3

The current Office action states that Figure 3 has not been approved, apparently because the version submitted in September 2000 showed three layers in the center section of the absorbent core, while the originally filed drawing showed a single layer. Also, as suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. It appears from the Office action dated June 2000 that the basis for correction is the originally filed informal (hand drawn) figure. Therefore, a copy of the originally filed version with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response.

Figure 4

The version of Figure 4 submitted in November 1998 was approved in the Office communication dated November 1999. However, as suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. Therefore, a copy of the November 1998 version with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response.

Figure 5

The current Office action states that the version of Figure 5 submitted in September 2000 has not been approved because a duplicate of the changes submitted in November 1998 and approved in November 1999 was unnecessarily re-submitted in September 2000. However, as suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. Therefore, a copy of the November 1998 version with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response.

Figure 6

The current Office action does not mention Figure 6. The most recent comment on Figure 6 that has been found in the file was made in the Office communication dated June 2000 and states that Figure 6 as originally filed (in its informal hand drawn version) remains in the Office file, despite the fact that a formal version of this figure was submitted in January 1998. No change is known to be needed, but neither a requirement for correction nor an approval of this figure was found. Therefore, it is requested that one or the other be provided in the next communication from the Office.

#### Figure 7

The current Office action states that the version of Figure 7 submitted in September 2000 has not been approved because it was not consistent with the prior Figure 7. The version of this figure submitted in November 1998 was approved in the Office communication dated November 1999. However, as suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. Therefore, a copy of the November 1998 version with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response.

#### Figure 8

In an objection raised in the current Office action to Figure 8, it was stated that the periphery 57 should be denoted. It appears that this denotation of the periphery 57 was shown in the version of Figure 8 submitted in March 2000. However, the June 2000 Office communication contains neither an approval nor a disapproval, in fact, no mention of the March 2000 version of Figure 8, and instead merely lists Figure 8 as one of several figures whose originally filed versions remain in the Office file, which it is presumed means that no subsequent version has ever been approved. Although the status of Figure 8 is thus unclear, a copy of the originally filed version of this figure with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response because it is believed that a line should be shown in association with the reference numeral 57 denoting the periphery rather than the arrow shown in the March 2000 version. Also, as suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. It is also noted that the reference numeral 55 does not appear in the proposed version of Figure 8, obviating that portion of the objection raised in the current Office action with respect to this reference numeral.

#### Figure 9

The current Office action does not mention Figure 9. The most recent comment on Figure 9 that has been found in the file was made in the Office communication dated June 2000 and states that Figure 9 as originally filed (in its informal hand drawn version) remains in the Office file, despite the fact that a formal version of this figure was submitted in January 1998. As suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. Therefore, a copy of the originally filed version with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response.

Figure 10

It is stated in the current Office action that the version of Figure 10 submitted in September 2000 has been approved. However, it is believed that the September 2000 version of Figure 10 contains errors in that both reference numerals **41** should read **44**. It appears that the change from **44** back to **41** was made in conjunction with changes to the specification on pages 7 and 12, where “aperture **44**” was likewise changed back to “opening **41**”, after having been corrected in the opposite direction in November 1998. It is presently believed that all of the occurrences of “opening **41**” on pages 7 and 12 in the specification and of the reference numeral **41** in Figure 10 should read “aperture **44**” and **41**, respectively, i.e., that the changes made in September 2000 were inappropriate. Also, as suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. Therefore, a copy of the September 2000 version with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response. It is noted that the reference numeral **55** does not appear in the approved September 2000 version, obviating that portion of the objection raised in the current Office action with respect to this reference numeral.

Figure 11

The current Office action does not mention Figure 11. The most recent comment on Figure 11 that has been found in the file was made in the Office communication dated June 2000 and states that Figure 11 as originally filed (in its informal hand drawn version) remains in the Office file, despite the fact that a formal version of this figure was submitted in January 1998. No change is known to be needed, but neither a requirement for correction nor an approval of this figure was found. Therefore, it is requested that one or the other be provided in the next communication from the Office.

Figure 12

The current Office action does not mention Figure 12. The most recent comment on Figure 12 that has been found in the file was made in the Office communication dated June 2000 and states that Figure 12 as originally filed (in its informal hand drawn version) remains in the Office file, despite the fact that a formal version of this figure was submitted in January 1998. As suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. Therefore, a copy of the originally filed version with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response.

### Figure 13

The current Office action does not mention Figure 13. The most recent comment on Figure 13 that has been found in the file was made in the Office communication dated June 2000 and states that Figure 13 as originally filed (in its informal hand drawn version) remains in the Office file, despite the fact that a formal version of this figure was submitted in January 1998. As suggested in the current Office action, prime marks should be added to particular reference numerals. Therefore, a copy of the originally filed version with markings to show proposed changes is included in this response.

### Figure 14

The version of Figure 14 submitted in September 2000 was approved in the current Office action and it is believed that no further action is needed with respect to this figure.

### Figures 15

The version of Figure 15 submitted in September 2000 was approved in the current Office action. However, the earlier version of Figure 15 submitted in November 1998 was also approved in the Office communication dated November 1999. Also, the version of Figure 15 submitted in September 2000 contains an error in the depiction of the layers. Specifically, the third layer is incorrectly shown as originating from "thin air" near entry point **100**, while it should be shown as originating as layer **87**, i.e., the lower of the two layers traveling around roll **96** and being laid down on top of layer **82**. The correction of this error will make this figure correctly depict the construction of a core like that shown in Figure 13, as described on page 27 in the third full paragraph in the specification as originally filed. Based on the presumption that the most recently approved version of the figure is the proper basis for correction, a copy of the September 2000 version with markings to show proposed changes is being submitted in this response. Please note that because of the small scale of the layers **81** and **82** shown lying on top of the conveyor **102**, it is impractical to mark the figure to indicate the deletion of the extraneous horizontal line depicting the top surface of the web that starts from "thin air" near entry point **100**. Therefore, the portion of the figure showing layers **84** and **87** being unwound and delivered to the conveyor **102** has simply been lowered by one web thickness so as to show the discrete sections **85** being laid directly on top of layer **82**, instead of on top of the "thin air" layer.

An objection was raised in the current Office action to the inconsistency between Figure 15 and the description on page 27 in the second full paragraph in the specification as originally filed. The inconsistent paragraph was extraneous and has been deleted in this response, leaving the correct description of Figure 15 immediately following the deleted paragraph.

#### Figure 16

The version of Figure 16 submitted in November 1998 was approved in the Office communication dated June 2000 and it is believed that no further action is needed with respect to this figure.

#### Figures 17 through 19

No mention of these three figures has been found in the Office communications on file. No change is known to be needed, but neither a requirement for correction nor an approval of any of these three figures was found. Therefore, it is requested that one or the other be provided for each figure in the next communication from the Office.

It is believed that the changes to the drawings proposed in this response fully address the objections raised in the current Office action and the approval of these changes is respectfully requested. It is understood that corrected formal drawings are not required to be submitted until the proposed drawing changes have been approved, in accordance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121(d) that “[u]pon approval by the examiner, new drawings...including the changes must be filed” and of form paragraph 6.22 (used in the current Office action) that “[a] proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are [sic] required in reply...” (underlining added for emphasis).